UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,619	12/27/2003	Vladimir S. Moxson		7498
	7590 06/09/200 ATERIALS PRODUC	EXAMINER		
1890 GEORGETOWN ROAD HUDSON, OH 44236			ZHU, WEIPING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/748,619	MOXSON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Examine	Art Unit		

	WEIPING ZHU	1793					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 18 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origing the contract of the con	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);					
appeal; and/or (d) ☑ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 2-4 and 17-19. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 5-14.		l be entered and an ex	oplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but of the reasons as stated in the final rejection.		condition for allowand	ce because:				
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/George Wyszomierski/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793	/Weiping Zhu/ Examiner, Art Unit 1793						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitations of proposed new claim 20 were not contained in the finally rejected claims and would require further search/consideration based on the change in the scope. Therefore, the proposed amendment filed on May 18, 2009 has not been entered.

Continuation of 13. Other: The examiner has responded properly to all applicant's arguments in the applicant's amendment filed on December 22, 2008 after the non-final Office action dated November 4, 2008. The following responses are to applicant's new arguments in the response dated May 18, 2009.

In response to applicant's argument that neither Gottselig et al. (US 4,961,529) nor Toyoda et al. (US Pub. 2003/0084969 A1) relates to titanium matrix composite materials; and Brupbacher et al. (US 5,059,490) in view of Gottselig et al. (US 4,961,529) and further in view of Toyoda et al. (US Pub. 2003/0084969 A1) does not disclose titanium matrix composite articles having improved mechanical properties as claimed in instant claims 2-4 and 17-19, the examiner notes that the prior art teachings with respect to titanium matrix composite material relies on the teaching of Brupbacher et al. rather than those of Gottselig et al. and Toyoda et al. No mechanical properties are recited in the instant claims, and therefore Brupbacher et al. in view of Gottselig et al. and Toyoda et al. are not required to disclose such properties of the titanium matrix composite materials in order to render the claimed materials obvious.

In response to applicant's argument that none of the prior art references contains aluminum-vanadium Al8V5 hard particles which are additionally incorporated into titanium matrix according to instant claim 4, the examiner notes that the titanium matrix composite material of Brupbacher et al.= in view of Gottselig et al. and Toyoda et al. contains TiCr2 as recited in instant claim 4. The presence of Al8V5 in the material is not required in the instant claim 4.